UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/657,624	09/08/2003	Christopher Vitello	200207120-1	1542
22879 7590 06/08/2007 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION			EXAMINER	
			NGUYEN, TAI V	
	S, CO 80527-2400		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3729	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•						
Office Action Summanus		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/657,624	VITELLO ET AL.			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Tai Van Nguyen	3729			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. IED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04 A</u>	oril 2007.				
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🛛	Claim(s) 1-4 and 7-34 is/are pending in the ap	plication.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-34 is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)🛛	)⊠ Claim(s) <u>8-10</u> is/are allowed.					
6)🖂	Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.					
,	Claim(s) <u>7</u> is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[]	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)[	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(	(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
A44	465					
Attachmer	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summa	ury (PTO-413)			
2) Notice	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail	Date			
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5)  Notice of Informa 6) Other:	I Patent Application			
1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Response to Amendment

1. In regards to the merits of Silverbrook (US 6,247,792) in the previous Non Final Rejection filed 1/16/2007, the applicants' argument that Silverbrook does not teach the feature of that the step using a solvent to dissolving dissolve the at least the portion of the channel core from the element after solidifying the molten material.

Accordingly, the previous Non Final rejection has been withdrawn.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claim1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Silverbrook (US 6,247,792) in view of DeBoer et al (US 6,345,880).

As applied to claims 1-3, Silverbrook disclose a method of creating an internal channel of a fluid-ejection device, the method comprising: encapsulating (column 5, lines 64-65) at least a portion of a channel core (19, 20, Fig 2) that corresponds to the internal channel in a molten material (50) of an element of the fluid-ejection device that corresponds to the internal channel (column 9, lines 49-54+); solidifying the molten material so that the at least the portion of the channel core is contained within the

Art Unit: 3729

element as molded plastic ink channels (19, 20); then used thermal expansion (CTE) and its high stiffness (see column 17, actuator mechanism).

However, Silverbrook does not discloses using a solvent to dissolving dissolve the at least the portion of the channel core from the element after solidifying the molten material.

DeBoer et al teaches using a solvent to dissolving dissolve the at least the portion of the channel core from the element after solidifying the molten material (see Example 2).

As applied to claim 4, Silverbrook disclose the composite channel core comprises a soluble material (18) and insoluble particles (19, 20) dispersed within the soluble material.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at this time the invention was made to have modified the method of Silverbrook by including by solvent, as taught by Deboer et al to positively provide the metal layer of print head as a strongly bonded (column 3, lines 22-25).

# Allowable Subject Matter

- 4. Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 5. Claims 8-10 is allowed.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: the prior art does not teach all of the limitations of the claimed invention including:

In claim 8: - after the molten material of the element of the fluid-ejection device solidifies within the mold cavity, removing the element of the fluid-ejection device from the mold while the at least the portion of the channel core is encapsulated by the solidified material of the element of the fluid-ejection device; and

- dissolving the at least the portion of the channel core that is encapsulated by the solidified material of the element of the fluid-ejection device after removing the element of the fluid-ejection device with the at least the portion of the channel core encapsulated thereby from the mold.

### Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-10 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Application/Control Number: 10/657,624

Art Unit: 3729

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tai Van Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-4567. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (7:30 A.M - 4:30 P.M).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter Vo can be reached on 571-272-4690. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

TN. May 31, 2007

A. DEXTER TUGBANG PRIMARY EXAMINER

Page 5